## Prompt Photon Production at HERA and LEP ICHEP 2004, Beijing

### Thomas Kluge, DESY on behalf of the H1, OPAL and ZEUS Collaborations

Introduction / Motivation

Photon Identification

Results

- Inclusive Prompt Photons
- Prompt Photons together with a Jet
- Conclusion / Summary



#### "Test QCD by measuring photons"

#### Prompt Photons and QCD



Prompt photon: small hadronisation uncertainty,

good energy measurement!

Two signatures are investigated

- 1) isolated photon (inclusive)
- 2) isolated photon + at least one jet ( $E_T > 3-5$  GeV)

#### **Production of Prompt Photons**



marks a remnant, made of low p<sub>T</sub> particles
 direct/single resolved (resolved/double resolved) both present in data
 ...there are more (higher order) diagrams

- 1. Basic  $\gamma$  selection: electromagnetic cluster, with no associated track Problem: large background of  $\pi^{0}$ -> $\gamma\gamma$  and  $\eta$ -> $\gamma\gamma$
- Require isolation cone: veto energy nearby the photon candidate Problem: sensitive to energy deposits from multiple interactions (m.i.)
- Perform a shower shape analysis: single photons are more compact
  -> Fit signal/background ratio for any result bin (independent of MC background rate!)



#### **Inclusive Prompt Photons in ep Photoproduction (HERA)**



H1 and ZEUS data consistent within errors
 MC: shape OK but normalisation low by ~40-50%

: direct exchanged γ makes up less than ½ of the cross section Multiple interactions spoil isolation cut -> reduced cross section

#### Inclusive Prompt Photons in ep Photoproduction (HERA)



142 < W < 266 GeV Q<sup>2</sup> < 1GeV<sup>2</sup> L<sub>int</sub> = 105 pb<sup>-1</sup>

Comparison with NLO pQCD: Fontanaz, Guillet, Heinrich (FGH)

Krawczyk, Zembruski(K&Z)

 Reasonable description by NLO calculations on parton level
 After corrections for hadronisation and multiple interactions: normalisation 30-40% below the data



 $< s_{ee} >^{2} = (197 \text{ GeV})^{2}$ Q<sup>2</sup> < 10 GeV<sup>2</sup>  $\mathscr{L}_{int} = 649 \text{ pb}^{-1}$ 

> Comparison with PYTHIA and NLO pQCD (Fontannaz et al)

PYTHIA: shape OK but normalisation low by ~50%
 NLO calculation on parton level gives good description of the data
 Variation from photon p.d.f. small compared to experimental uncertainty

#### Inclusive Prompt Photons in ep Deep Inelastic Scattering (HERA)



■ MC lower than data by factors 2 (PYTHIA) and 8 (HERWIG) ■ Shape of E<sub>t</sub> well described, PYTHIA gives a poor description of pseudorapidity  $\eta^{\gamma}$ 

The MCs do not include wide-angle QED bremsstrahlung

#### Jet + Prompt Photon: a handle to direct and resolved reactions



x: Fractional part of the incoming photon energy, taking part in interaction
 Definitions are infrared safe for x -> 1

Jet E<sub>t</sub> does not enter the definition (but hadronic final state does via y)

#### Jet + Prompt Photon in ep Deep Inelastic Scattering (HERA)



NLO calculation on parton level: normalisation reasonable poor description at low E<sub>t</sub> and in the more forward (proton beam) direction
 PYTHIA and HERWIG still by factors 2-4 too low (not shown)

#### Jet + Prompt Photon in ep Photoproduction (HERA)



Reasonable description of the data by both NLO calculation on parton level

If a jet is required: slightly better description, NLO/LO correction more moderate

Corrections for hadronisation and multiple interactions, taken from PYTHIA, do not improve the description



Photon structure enters at lower x≲0.85 (resolved contribution)

Shape of the distributions different for HERA and LEP
 Both: NLO consistent with the data
 multiple interactions more important at low x<sub>γ</sub> (resolved photon)

# Summary

Prompt photons: study pQCD and p.d.f. of proton and photon
 Alternative to jets:

no hadronisation of the photon, good energy measurement
 small cross section, elaborate photon identification

Consistent findings for  $\gamma p$ ,DIS (HERA) and  $\gamma \gamma$  (LEP)

- MC generators PYTHIA, HERWIG: always undershoot the data, shape in general OK
- NLO QCD calculations on parton level are in reasonable agreement with the data
- If multiple interactions and hadronisation are taken into account, the NLO calculations somewhat undershoot the data (H1)

Why are the predictions low? Higher orders? Non-perturbative effects?

Possible improvements of data analyses: extend phasespace, use more data (HERA II), refine  $\pi^0$  supression/subtraction